

fraudulent in that the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects claimed. Further misbranding was alleged because the statement "No \* \* \* dangerous drug" was false and misleading.

On May 23, 1924, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12390. Misbranding of Pratt's cow remedy. U. S. v. 2½ Dozen Packages of Pratt's Cow Remedy. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 14847. S. No. E-3351.)**

On May 4, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Rhode Island, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 2½ dozen packages of Pratt's cow remedy remaining in the original unbroken packages at Providence, R. I., consigned by the Pratt Food Co., Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped from Philadelphia, Pa., on or about August 27, 1920, and transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Rhode Island, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of a mixture of salt, soda, Epsom salt, iron oxid, fenugreek, ginger, nux vomica, and gentian.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the following statements appearing in the labels, (package) "Pratt's Cow Remedy is a tested remedy and preventive for Contagious abortion, Barrenness (Failure to Breed), Garget, Milk Fever, \* \* \* For Barrenness \* \* \* prevents retained afterbirth, \* \* \* For Calves: For preventing or treating scours \* \* \* Pratt's Cow Remedy will assist in rendering the bull's service more sure, particularly where contagious abortion has appeared in the herd \* \* \* For Accidental Or Contagious Abortion \* \* \* To Prevent: In herds where cows have previously aborted, or in neighborhoods where disease exists, \* \* \* Contagious Abortion: \* \* \* Retained Afterbirth \* \* \* Pratt's Cow Remedy Is A Medicinal Specific for diseases of cows \* \* \* preventive and remedy for cow troubles," were false and fraudulent in that the article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects claimed.

On May 23, 1924, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12391. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. 108 Cases and 7,614 Cases of Salmon. Consent decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. Nos. 17828, 17829. I. S. Nos. 8391-v, 8392-v, 8393-v, 8394-v, 8395-v, 11498-v. S. Nos. W-1420, W-1421.)**

On September 19, 1923, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying the seizure and condemnation of 7,722 cases of salmon remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by Libby, McNeill & Libby from Koggien, Alaska, on or about August 12, 1923, and transported from the Territory of Alaska into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On June 11, 1924, Libby, McNeill & Libby, claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libels and consented to the entry of decrees, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of bonds in the aggregate sum of \$10,250, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product be sorted under the supervision of this department, the bad portion destroyed, and the good portion released.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*